



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/589,001

07/02/2007

Didier Gouelibio

062842

4625

38834

7590

02/16/2011

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

LEWIS, JUSTIN V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3725

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/16/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentmail@whda.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/589,001	GOUELIBO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JUSTIN V. LEWIS	3725	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants' amendment, filed on 01 December 2010, is acknowledged.

Amended claims 1, 6, 8, 10-14, 16, 19, 21-23, 25-27 and 31 have been entered.

Accordingly, claims 1-31 are presently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-9, 11-18 and 20-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,697,649 to Dames et al. ("Dames") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,533,325 to Steidinger ("Steidinger '325").

Regarding claim 1, Dames discloses a method of manufacturing elements of relatively small size (see abstract, providing that the invention concerns the production

Art Unit: 3725

of planchettes for use with security documents), comprising: i) unwinding a wound sheet (see col. 8, lines 10-12, providing that a film or web is fed from a roll to a printing press), then; ii) optionally, printing this sheet at least partly on at least one side and then (see col. 8, lines 14-16, providing that a film or web is passed between a print roller and an impression roller); iii) cutting deeply right through the sheet by a succession of at least two cutting patterns that intersect so as to constitute a resulting pattern that forms a detached element constituting the element of relatively small size (see col. 7, lines 15-19, providing that the sheet can be divided into a large number of planchettes by a die cutting operation); and iv) recovering the detached elements that form said elements of relatively small size are recovered (see col. 7, lines 20-22, providing that planchettes that were formed in the above referenced die cutting operation are introduced into security papers), but fails to disclose the cutting operation taking place by means of a succession of synchronized cutting cylinders each carrying at least one respective cutting thread that cuts one of the cutting patterns respectively, said cutting cylinders being in succession along a conveying path of the sheet, at least one anvil cylinder being interposed between these cutting cylinders, the sheet passing between all these cylinders.

Steidinger '325 teaches the concept of providing a cutting operation (rotary die cutting station 132) taking place by means of a succession of synchronized cutting cylinders (combination of magnetic die cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135) each carrying at least one respective cutting thread (dies 134) that cuts one of the cutting patterns respectively (see col. 13, lines 19-25, providing that dies 134 and the overall

Art Unit: 3725

die cutting station 132 die cut a plurality of plies passing through them), said cutting cylinders (combination of magnetic die cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135) being in succession (see col. 5, showing magnetic dye cylinder 133 positioned directly above anvil cylinder 135) along a conveying path of the sheet (see fig. 5; note that magnetic dye cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135 are positioned along the conveying path), at least one anvil cylinder (135) being interposed between these cutting cylinders (note that between the two cylinders- magnetic die cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135, one is an anvil cylinder; note further that in an alternative arrangement corresponding with an alternative interpretation of the term "between," it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide more than one magnetic die cylinder 133 as an additional instance of an element already taught, and cause each said magnetic die cylinder 133 to cooperate with the underlying anvil cylinder 135), and a sheet (web 111) passing between all these cylinders (see col. 13, lines 9-26, describing the overall cutting process; also see fig. 5, providing a graphic representation of the process).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the Dames dies with the Steidinger rotary die cutting station in order to permit the convenient removal of the planchettes from the roll and the provision of edges which are smooth to sight and touch, as explicitly taught by Steidinger '325 (see abstract).

Regarding claim 2, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the steps are carried out in line (see the combination set

Art Unit: 3725

forth in the rejection of claim 1, above, wherein a web is fed from a roll into a printing station, then into a cutting station, thereby separated, and then its generated planchettes incorporated into a security document).

Regarding claim 3, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the method as claimed in claim 2, but fails to specifically disclose the method being carried out at a speed of between 20 and 150 m/min. However, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select a moderate processing speed in order to achieve maximal possible production while maintaining a low error rate.

Regarding claim 4, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the method as claimed in claim 1, wherein said sheet is a sheet of paper, a sheet of nonwoven or a sheet of plastic, or a complex of these materials (see Dames col. 1, lines 22-23, providing that the generated planchettes may be formed from paper and/or plastic).

Regarding claim 5, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the sheet is printed by flexography (see Dames col. 8, lines 11-13, providing that a flexographic multi-station printing press may be used).

Regarding claim 6, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the sheet is printed, but fails to specifically disclose the sheet being printed in an amount of 1 to 10 g/m² per side. However, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. In the instant matter, it would

Art Unit: 3725

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select a value between 1 and 10 g/m² per size in order to ensure that the sheet is not unduly weighed down by printed indicia.

Regarding claim 7, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the sheet is printed on only one side (see Dames claim 25, permitting the disposition of reflective metal material upon "at least one side").

Regarding claim 8, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the sheet is printed on both its sides in succession by front/back registration (see Dames claim 25, permitting the disposition of reflective metal material upon "at least one side").

Regarding claim 9, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the method as claimed in claim 1, wherein said sheet has a thickness, but fails to specifically claim said thickness being between 5 and 110 micrometers. However, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. In the instant matter, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select a relatively small sheet thickness in order to eventually provide planchettes sufficiently thin to be incorporated into security documents without substantially altering the surface thickness of said security documents.

Regarding claim 11, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the manufacturing method as claimed in claim 1, but fails to specifically disclose the largest dimension of the detached element being between 0.5 and 6 mm. However, where the

Art Unit: 3725

general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. In the instant matter, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select relatively small dimensions for an element in order to eventually provide planchettes sufficiently small to be easily incorporated into security documents without dominating the surfaces thereof.

Regarding claim 12, Dames, as modified by Steidinger '325 (in the manner set forth in the rejection of claim 1, above), discloses a method of cutting out elements of relatively small size (see Dames abstract, providing that the invention concerns the production of planchettes for use with security documents), comprising: i) providing a sheet (see Dames col. 8, lines 10-12, providing that a film or web is fed from a roll to a printing press); and ii) cutting deeply right through said sheet (see Dames col. 7, lines 15-19, providing that the sheet can be divided into a large number of planchettes by a die cutting operation) continuously, by a succession of at least two cutting patterns that intersect so as to constitute a resulting pattern that forms a detached element constituting the element of relatively small size (see the combination set forth in the rejection of claim 1, above, wherein Steidinger '325 cylinders are provided for attachment to the Dames apparatus), this cutting operation taking place using a succession of synchronized cutting cylinders (combination of Steidinger '325 magnetic die cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135) each carrying at least one respective cutting thread (Steidinger '325 dies 134) that cuts one of the cutting patterns respectively (see Steidinger '325 col. 13, lines 19-25, providing that dies 134 and the overall die cutting

Art Unit: 3725

station 132 die cut a plurality of plies passing through them), said cutting cylinders (combination of Steidinger '325 magnetic die cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135) being in succession (see Steidinger '325 col. 5, showing magnetic dye cylinder 133 positioned directly above anvil cylinder 135) along a conveying path of the sheet (see Steidinger '325 fig. 5; note that magnetic dye cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135 are positioned along the conveying path), at least one anvil cylinder (Steidinger '325 135) being interposed between these cutting cylinders (note that between the two cylinders-magnetic die cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135, one is an anvil cylinder; note further that in an alternative arrangement corresponding with an alternative interpretation of the term "between," it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide more than one magnetic die cylinder 133 as an additional instance of an element already taught, and cause each said magnetic die cylinder 133 to cooperate with the underlying anvil cylinder 135).

Regarding claim 13, Dames, as modified by Steidinger '325 (in the manner set forth in the rejection of claim 1, above), discloses a device for cutting out elements of relatively small size, (see Dames abstract, providing that the invention concerns the production of planchettes for use with security documents), wherein it comprises a rotary cutting device (Steidinger '325 rotary die cutting station 132) comprising a succession of synchronized cutting cylinders (combination of Steidinger '325 magnetic die cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135) having respective cutting threads (Steidinger '325 dies 134), said cutting cylinders (combination of Steidinger '325 magnetic die cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135) being in succession (see Steidinger '325 col. 5,

Art Unit: 3725

showing magnetic die cylinder 133 positioned directly above anvil cylinder 135) along a conveyance path of a sheet to be cut (see Steidinger '325 fig. 5; note that magnetic die cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135 are positioned along the conveying path), anvil cylinders (Steidinger '325 135) being interposed between these cutting cylinders (note that between the two cylinders- magnetic die cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135, one is an anvil cylinder; note further that in an alternative arrangement corresponding with an alternative interpretation of the term "between," it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide more than one magnetic die cylinder 133 as an additional instance of an element already taught, and cause each said magnetic die cylinder 133 to cooperate with the underlying anvil cylinder 135), the cutting threads (Steidinger '325 dies 134) on the cylinders (combination of Steidinger '325 magnetic die cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135) being complementary so as to form at least two cutting patterns that intersect so as to constitute a resulting pattern that forms a detached element from the sheet when the cutting cylinders rotate in a synchronized manner and when suitably adjusted (see col. 13, lines 17-26, providing that magnetic die cylinder 133 and dies 134 may be combined to provide an engraved die-cutting cylinder, which cuts through web 111).

Regarding claim 14, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the cutting device as claimed in claim 13, wherein each cutting cylinder (combination of Steidinger '325 magnetic die cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135) is a magnetic cylinder (note that Steidinger '325 magnetic die cylinder is described as being "magnetic") covered with a magnetizable flexible plate (Steidinger '325 magnetic dies 134) retained by

Art Unit: 3725

demagnetization forces, bearing the cutting threads (see Steidinger '325 col. 13, lines 19-22, providing that magnetic dies 134 include microperforations configured to fully cut through a web), but fails to disclose said cutting threads specifically being electrochemically etched. However, the instant limitation, specifying a process by which said cutting threads are etched, fails to further limit the physical limitations of the cutting device that is the primary subject of the instant claim. Accordingly, said limitation will not be afforded patentable weight.

Regarding claim 15, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the cutting device as claimed in claim 14, wherein it includes a base anvil cylinder (Steidinger '325 135).

Regarding claim 16, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses a device for manufacturing elements of relatively small size (see Dames abstract, providing that the invention concerns the production of planchettes for use with security documents), wherein it includes a reel holder (see Dames fig. 5, showing roll 147 being utilized in association with the apparatus; note that as such, the apparatus includes a roll or "reel" holder), a printing device, with at least one printing unit (see Dames col. 8, lines 14-16, providing that a film or web is passed between a print roller and an impression roller), and a cutting device as claimed in claim 13 (Steidinger '325 rotary die cutting station 132).

Regarding claim 17, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the device as claimed in claim 16, wherein it includes a printing device (see Dames col. 8, lines 14-16, providing that a film or web is passed between a print roller and an impression roller)

Art Unit: 3725

having at least two printing units (Dames print roller and impression roller) with a set of bars for turning the sheet over between the units (see Steidinger '325 col. 12, line 66, providing that web 111 is turned over using a turn bar apparatus).

Regarding claim 18, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the device as claimed in claim 16, wherein it includes a printing unit (see Dames col. 8, lines 14-16, providing that a film or web is passed between a print roller and an impression roller) having at least two printing units (Dames print roller and impression roller) with a device for reversing the rotation of one of the printing units (motorized feeds within printers).

Regarding claim 20, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the manufacturing device as claimed in claim 16, wherein it includes an antistatic treatment device (note that each metallic component of the device functions as an "antistatic treatment device," as it functions to discharge any accumulated static electricity).

Regarding claim 21, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses a security element of relatively small size (see Dames abstract, providing that the invention concerns the production of planchettes for use with security documents), wherein it is obtained using the manufacturing method of claim 1 (see the combination set forth in the rejection of claim 1, above) and it includes identification patterns (Dames indicia 20) observable to the naked eye (see Dames fig. 4).

Regarding claim 22, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the security element as claimed in claim 21, wherein it includes patterns (Dames indicia 20) chosen from patterns visible in natural light, patterns visible under UV light, luminescent patterns, fluorescent patterns, phosphorescent patterns, patterns detectable by near

Art Unit: 3725

infrared radiation, patterns detectable by intermediate infrared radiation, thermochromatic patterns, piezochromatic patterns, patterns based on DNA tracers, patterns that are optically variable, iridescent patterns, patterns based on liquid crystals, patterns based on diffraction gratings, moire patterns, holograms, electromagnetic patterns, and combinations thereof (see Dames fig. 1, showing a pattern of indicia that is visible).

Regarding claim 23, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the security element as claimed in claim 21, wherein it includes, beneath or alongside said patterns, printing of electromagnetic character (see Dames col. 1, lines 37-43, providing that planchettes could be provided with special magnetic properties such as discontinuities in the magnetic material or coded variations in the magnetization of the material).

Regarding claim 24, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the security element as claimed in claim 21, wherein it includes chemical authentication reactants or reactants that reveal a specific event (see Dames col. 6, lines 11-19, providing that demetallization may be accomplished via chemical etching).

Regarding claim 25, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses a security element of relatively small size (see Dames abstract, providing that the invention concerns the production of planchettes for use with security documents), wherein it is obtained using the manufacturing method of claim 1 (see the combination set forth in the rejection of claim 1, above), and wherein the shape of said element is a security characteristic (see Dames col. 5, lines 43-50, providing that the shape of the security

Art Unit: 3725

element may determine the magnetic response through the influence of shape-determined permeability effects).

Regarding claim 26, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses a security sheet comprising a fibrous substrate (see Dames col. 7, lines 26-30, providing that the sheet may be formed from paper) which includes at least one security element of relatively small size (see Dames abstract, providing that the invention concerns the production of planchettes for use with security documents) obtained using the manufacturing method of claim 1 (see the combination set forth in the rejection of claim 1, above).

Regarding claim 27, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses a decorative sheet comprising a fibrous substrate (see Dames col. 7, lines 26-30, providing that the sheet may be formed from paper), which includes at least one decorative element of relatively small size (see Dames abstract, providing that the invention concerns the production of planchettes for use with security documents) obtained using the manufacturing method of claim 1 (see the combination set forth in the rejection of claim 1, above).

Regarding claim 28, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses a security document comprising, as base, a sheet as claimed in claim 26 (see Dames col. 7, lines 26-30, providing that the sheet may be formed from paper).

Regarding claim 29, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses a package comprising a sheet as claimed in claim 26 (see Dames col. 7, lines 26-30, providing that the sheet may be formed from paper).

Regarding claim 30, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses a security element as claimed in claim 21, wherein the shape of said element is a security characteristic (see Dames col. 5, lines 43-50, providing that the shape of the security element may determine the magnetic response through the influence of shape-determined permeability effects).

Regarding claim 31, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses a security sheet comprising a fibrous substrate (see Dames col. 7, lines 26-30, providing that the sheet may be formed from paper) which includes at least one security element as claimed in claim 21 (see the combination set forth in the rejection of claim 21, above).

5. Claims 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dames in view of Steidinger '325 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,350,342 to Steidinger et al. ("Steidinger '342").

Regarding claim 10, Dames in view of Steidinger '325 discloses the method as claimed in claim 1, but fails to disclose the detached elements being recovered by stripping.

Steidinger '342 teaches the concept of detached elements being recovered by stripping (see col. 5, lines 64-66, providing that subsequent to a die cutting process, portions of a web may be separated by way of a peel bar or roller).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the Steidinger '342 peel bar/roller into the apparatus of Dames in view of Steidinger '325 in order to provide a means of separating the die cut

Art Unit: 3725

planchettes from the web from which they originate, as taught by Steidinger '342 (see col. 5, lines 64-66).

Regarding claim 19, Dames in view of Steidinger '325, as modified by Steidinger '342 (in the manner set forth in the rejection of claim 10, above), discloses the manufacturing device as claimed in claim 16, wherein it includes, after the cutting device, a stripping device (see the combination set forth in the rejection of claim 10, above, wherein the Steidinger '342 peel bar/roller is incorporated into the apparatus of Dames in view of Steidinger '325).

Response to Arguments

In response to Applicants' argument that Steidinger '325 fails to disclose a succession of cutting cylinders at col. 13, lines 9-26 (see Applicants' Arguments/Remarks pg. 10, lines 12-13), Examiner respectfully asserts that Steidinger '325 indeed discloses a succession of cutting cylinders in the combination of magnetic die cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135, which work together to form cuts in a web passing through said cylinders, per col. 13, lines 13-26, providing in part, "The web... proceeds to a rotary die cutting station... includ[ing] a magnetic die cylinder, flexible magnetic dies... and a cooperating anvil cylinder..."

In response to Applicants' argument that Steidinger '325 does not disclose a second cutting cylinder collaborating with the cutting cylinder 133 (see Applicant's Arguments/Remarks pg. 10, lines 16-17), Examiner respectfully asserts that as set forth above, col. 13, lines 13-26 provides that anvil cylinder 135 collaborates with cutting cylinder 133.

In response to Applicants' argument that Steidinger '325 does not provide any motivation or incentive to arrive at "a succession of at least two cutting patterns that intersect so as to constitute a resulting pattern that will form a detached element constituting the element of relatively small size," let alone in a manner such that "this cutting operation taking place by means of a succession of synchronized cutting cylinders each carrying at least one respective cutting thread that cuts one of the cutting patterns respectively, said cutting cylinders being in succession along a conveying path of the sheet, at least one anvil cylinder being interposed between these cutting cylinders, the sheet passing between all these cylinders" as recited in present claims 1 and 12 (see Applicants' Arguments/Remarks pg. 11, lines 8-15), Examiner respectfully asserts that as set forth above, Steidinger '325 indeed discloses a succession of cutting cylinders in the combination of magnetic die cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135, which work together to form cuts in a web passing through said cylinders, per col. 13, lines 13-26, providing in part, "The web... proceeds to a rotary die cutting station... includ[ing] a magnetic die cylinder, flexible magnetic dies... and a cooperating anvil cylinder..." Note that Examiner has interpreted the term "between" in the sense of "within the group." Note that in an alternative arrangement corresponding with an alternative interpretation of the term "between" as used in the claims, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide more than one magnetic die cylinder 133 as an additional instance of an element already taught, and cause each said magnetic die cylinder 133 to cooperate with the underlying anvil cylinder 135.

In response to Applicants' argument that Steidinger '325 does not provide any motivation or incentive to arrive at "a succession of synchronized cutting cylinders having respective cutting threads, said cutting cylinders being in succession along a conveyance path of a sheet to be cut, anvil cylinder being interposed between these cutting cylinders, the cutting threads on the cylinders being complimentary so as to form at least two cutting patterns that intersect so as to constitute a resulting pattern that forms a detached element from the sheet when the cutting cylinders rotate in a synchronized manner and when suitably adjusted" as recited in present claim 13 (see Applicants' Arguments/Remarks pg. 11, line 16- pg. 12, line 2), Examiner respectfully asserts that as set forth above, Steidinger '325 indeed discloses a succession of cutting cylinders in the combination of magnetic die cylinder 133 and anvil cylinder 135, which work together to form cuts in a web passing through said cylinders, per col. 13, lines 13-26, providing in part, "The web... proceeds to a rotary die cutting station... includ[ing] a magnetic die cylinder, flexible magnetic dies... and a cooperating anvil cylinder..." Note that Examiner has interpreted the term "between" in the sense of "within the group." Note that in an alternative arrangement corresponding with an alternative interpretation of the term "between" as used in the claims, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide more than one magnetic die cylinder 133 as an additional instance of an element already taught, and cause each said magnetic die cylinder 133 to cooperate with the underlying anvil cylinder 135.

In response to Applicants' argument that Steidinger '325 does not provide any guidance or suggestion regarding the cutting of elements of relatively small size such as

planchettes (see Applicants' Arguments/Remarks pg. 12, lines 5-6), Examiner respectfully asserts that it is the Dames reference that discloses the desirability of creating planchettes. Steidinger '325 is merely used for the suggestion of forming cutting means with cutting cylinders.

In response to Applicants' argument that Dames is silent regarding synchronized cutting cylinders (see Applicants' Arguments/Remarks pg. 12, line 9), Examiner respectfully asserts that Steidinger '325 is used for the suggestion of forming cutting means with synchronized cutting cylinders.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent No. 6,022,442.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3725

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JUSTIN V. LEWIS whose telephone number is (571)270-5052. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dana Ross can be reached on (571) 272-4480. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dana Ross/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3725
/JVL/